

5

**REMARKS**

The present application was filed on June 2, 2005 with claims 1 through 26. Claims 1 through 26 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 17 and 26 are proposed to be amended herein.

10 In the Office Action, the Examiner maintained a rejection of claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens (United States Patent Number 6,404,880).

Independent claims 1, 17, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens. Regarding claims 1, 17, and 26, the Examiner asserts that Stevens teaches a method for providing a notification of an event, comprising the steps of receiving a communication (citing col. 2, lines 34-43 and col. 3, lines 12-36); determining an originating endpoint address on a  
15 network associated with said communication (citing element 110 in FIG. 1 as the originating endpoint address); identifying one or more designated persons associated with said originating endpoint address associated with said communication, wherein at least one of said designated persons is not a sender of said communication (citing Fig. 2 and noting that designated recipient is associated with the originating endpoint address and that the weather service sends the communication); generating a notification  
20 message; and sending said notification message to said one or more designated persons (col. 3, lines 12-36).

Applicants again note that Stevens is directed to “providing subscriber alerts that warn the subscriber to severe weather and traffic conditions.” Stevens also teaches that “the subscriber may receive wakeup and reminder calls.” (See, Abstract.) Assuming solely for the sake of argument that the  
25 wakeup and reminder calls are triggered by employing a “caller ID” type function to obtain the telephone number of the calling party, the wakeup and reminder calls are placed back to the same original calling party.

In addition, the embodiment that provides alerts that warn the subscriber of severe weather and traffic conditions are also placed back to the same subscriber. Although not explicitly  
30 stated in Stevens, it is believed that in this embodiment, the telephone number of the subscriber is captured during a registration process using a “caller ID” type function to obtain the telephone number of the calling party, or is explicitly provided by the subscriber during the registration.

Among other differences, Applicants assert that the trigger that leads to the generation of a notification message is different in Stevens versus the present invention. Applicants have amended

5 each independent claim to emphasize that the generation of the notification message and several other steps are performed *in response to the receipt of the communication*.

The trigger in Stevens, however, is that if the conditions set forth in field 210 match the weather information received from the weather service 110, an alert will be sent to the subscriber. The subscriber has indicated the conditions 210 for the alert, as well as the communication methods 230 for  
 10 receiving the alert. The weather service 110 is merely providing weather information that is matched against the subscriber conditions.

Applicants have also amended each independent claim to replace the “person associated with” language by “persons that have been previously designated.” The weather service 110 has not designated one or more persons to receive the information. Thus, there are no “designated persons that  
 15 have been previously designated for said originating endpoint address.”

*In response to a received communication*, the present invention determines an originating endpoint address on a network associated with a received communication, in a similar manner to a caller ID function in a telephone domain. The obtained originating endpoint address associated with the communication is then used to identify one or more **previously designated** persons to receive a  
 20 notification message, wherein at least one of said designated persons is not a sender of said communication.

Thus, Stevens does not disclose or suggest receiving a communication; and *in response to the receipt of the communication*, performing the following steps:

“determining an originating endpoint address on a network associated with said received  
 25 communication;

identifying one or more designated persons that have been previously designated for said originating endpoint address, wherein at least one of said designated persons is not a sender of said communication;

generating a notification message; and

30 sending said notification message to said one or more designated persons,”  
 as variously required by each independent claim.

#### Dependent Claims 2-16 and 18-25

Dependent claims 2-16 and 18-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens. Claims 2-16 and 18-25 are dependent on claims 1 and 17, respectively, and are

5 therefore patentably distinguished over Stevens because of their dependency from amended independent claims 1, 17, and 26 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the  
10 telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



15 Date: January 31, 2007

Kevin M. Mason  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 36,597  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
20 (203) 255-6560